

The Ohio Democrat.

VOLUME 24.

NEW PHILADELPHIA, O., SEPTEMBER 25, 1863.

NUMBER 41.

THE GREAT SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM ALLEN, Delivered at Hamilton, Butler County, on the 10th of September, 1863.

Three years ago this nation was free; the country was prosperous, and over every acre of soil there prevailed law and order, peace and happiness. Up to that period not the first drop of human blood had, from the foundation of the government, been shed for a political offense; but now the land is desolated with the most stupendous civil war that has ever disgraced the face of our planet, or cast a reproach upon the frailty of our nature. Instead of this old peace, we have this destructive war; instead of the security which this gave, and which was enjoyed by every citizen, we are now endangered for no other crime than for our opinions; to have our houses entered at midnight by armed men, and our people taken off to be tried, not before a jury, but before a military inquisition, and, for the crime of thinking, condemned to exile. [Great cheers.] Wherever there is a great effect produced, whether in the world of politics, morals, or in the world of matter, there must be a corresponding cause to produce it. What cause could that be which was powerful enough to transform this great people from a band of associated brothers into so many inveterate enemies? Was it because you disagreed with each other on the questions of the internal policy of the Government, such as the Tariff question, the Bank question, or the Distribution of the Proceeds of the Public Lands? No; that belonged to the class of questions which could be debated and decided, and acted upon without endangering the interests of the country, or without inflicting any more evil than the temporary endurance of an indefinite public measure. But there was another class of questions, and these were precisely of that class of questions which our forefathers foresaw, and against which they so loudly and so repeatedly admonished us. These were local, sectional questions; questions calculated to array one part of the States against another part, and there happened to be in this country one faction which admitted of being used for the purpose of destroying the Union through the very instrumentality that had been anticipated by our forefathers. No question touching commerce, no question touching agriculture, or the mechanical arts, no question which had any relation whatever to the bare means of subsistence or happiness among the people should be made a local question; no question of this sort could ever be made a sectional question by which the people of one end of the Union could be made the enemies of the other end of the Union. But there was one question, one fact which afforded an opportunity for evil-minded men to produce this mischief, and this question was

The Slavery Question.

Now, my friends, I wish to make some few remarks upon this subject, which I wish you all to hear in mind and think over when you are upon your farms and in your workshops. First, remember the fact that slavery existed before our Government; remember that slavery was no fault of the American people. It was brought here by British legislation; it was here when our thirteen original States were colonies. The fact, then, of slavery existing was no fault of our Government—either State or Federal. After the revolution, the States—being bound together only by temporary association—were all independent of each other. When the revolutionary war was concluded, they were at liberty; if they thought proper, to extend side by side as so many independent sovereignties. The revolutionary war had given them a right to exist. The Articles of Confederation which bound them together during the war ceased with the war, and therefore each State was independent to act for itself. All this time slavery existed. The Constitution of the United States was formed; being no more nor less than a treaty or stipulation between the States with regard to their future conduct. When the Constitution was formed, therefore, the fact of slavery existed, and consequently no act could deprive it of its life. When the Constitution was adopted, slavery was recognized in its double aspect. It was recognized even as an article of foreign commerce, and as a subject of stipulation placed in the body of the Constitution that the slave should not be extended—where? Beyond all. But that the African slave-trade should not be stopped for twenty years. Mark that! For twenty years from the adoption of the Federal Constitution—up to 1808, the Government having gone into operation twelve years before the conclusion of the last century, and eight years of this century, the twenty years within which it was lawful to carry on the slave-trade by importing fresh slaves from Africa. Now, when the Convention put in this amendment, limiting the duration of the African slave-trade, why did they not put in an amendment limiting the duration of slavery in the States? Because they had no power to put it there. [Laughter.] But yet it was a sin, then was the time for the Abolitionists to have prevented from entering the new Government.

The Garden of Eden.

Here was the Garden of Eden. A new Constitution about to be formed, they were about to start up a new state of existence. If slavery was a sin, now

of shall be plucked. But they did not even make a proposition. They never offered, they never pretended to have the right to interfere with slavery. Now, you will observe that the tendency of the population of this country has been regulated by climate. The great fact that the two races exist upon the continent, is a fact that existed before the Government. In the course of time it was found that the Northern people preferred white labor, and in order to make way they sent their slaves South and sold them. The South was willing to receive black labor, and thus both parties were gratified, one making his choice of white and the other of black labor. Now suppose there had been no South to send those negroes to. As a matter of course, these negroes would have been among them, and the places now occupied by a million white laborers would have been occupied by a million of free negroes. Now, it is a curious want to reverse this state of things. They have seized upon this war as the instrumentality by which they can just reverse this order of things. Now, what do they want to do? They want to bring the negro back to the North, to make room for him, to send as many white men of our people as they can to the war to be killed. Now, my friends, I never justified this rebellion, nor did I ever justify the intermeddling spirit that gave being to this rebellion. These Abolitionists say slavery is the cause of the war; I say it is not. They say slavery ought to be exterminated; I say it ought not. [Cheers.]

Slavery is Not the Cause of the War.

Slavery is not the cause of the war; it is the intermeddling of some men with other men's business. If any fellows should come here and undertake to disperse this crowd this evening, and should happen to get hurt, they could not say that this meeting was the cause of it. [Cheers.] The cause of it would be that they tried to break the meeting up. I asked the question on a former occasion, and no Abolitionist has ever been found that had sense enough to answer it. [Laughter.] If there had been no Abolitionists in the North, should we ever have had this war in the South? [Cries of "Never."] One newspaper, edited by a wise Abolitionist, thought he was answering my question—he must be a wise man—by adopting the Yankee logic of asking another question. He asked: "If there had been no slavery in the South, would there have been any war?" I answer him thus: Slavery was in the South under the guarantee of the Constitution. Your intermeddling was guaranteed neither by common honesty, nor by the Constitution either. [That's good.] If slavery was the cause of the war, then it would not have required an Abolition party to have brought the war about. I illustrate this by the common facts of history, to show you that these Abolitionists rise up and think they say a great thing; but the truth of the business is, that they have had such a lack of piety and persecution of the people, that they have become utterly incapable of reasoning about the common affairs of life. They think they make a great case by repeating the question, and making the declaration of slavery being the cause of the war. Therefore slavery must be exterminated before they can have peace. Now for these historical reminiscences.

The Cause of the War.

Everybody knows there have been great wars about religion. In all parts of the world these wars have existed more or less extensively and more or less frequently. Not long since there were thirty years of war in Europe—about what? About religion. Well, now, according to the Abolitionists, religion ought to be exterminated in order to have got rid of the war. [Laughter.] Religion being the cause, the only way of getting rid of it was by cutting the throat of every man who professed it. By getting a decree pronounced by some person like Abraham Lincoln, that the Bible is all false, and its teachers all liars, and therefore having been the cause of the war, it ought to be exterminated in order to get peace. [Cheers.] But, my friends, this would be unjust, and it would have been unjust to say that religion has been the cause of the war. It has been the cause of war in no other sense than that it has afforded a pretext to interpose on the opinions of others. Did you ever hear any talk about a war in the United States about religion? I answer, never. Because there are a great many religions here, and a great many parts where there is no religion at all. There are Jews and Mohammedans; there are Catholics and Protestants; and these Protestants are divided up into half a dozen different denominations, and they are composed of foreigners and natives—those who have taken the oath of allegiance and those who have not—all men from all climes have been living here under our Constitution for seventy-four years, and no civil war about religion. Why so? Because our forefathers, seeing that religion had been made a pretext for civil war, did not declare that there should be in the United States no religion. They did not undertake to exterminate religion. What they did was to put into the organic law a protection to religious denominations and sects of all kinds and descriptions, so that we could not cut the throats of one another. By tolerating all opinions, by protecting all men in their rights, there has been no quarrel. These people have had it in their own way to argue; they have sweat about it, and used a great deal of ink in their religious controversies, but, no blood. The very moment they attempted to shed each other's blood

we should not have sent General Burnside's spies, we should have sent the Sheriff of the county, and, if the Sheriff is not strong enough, he calls the farmers of the county to help him, and if the man be Jew, infidel, atheist, or the devil himself they will take him. If a man knock out the brains of another, he can not escape by saying that the man whose brains he knocked out was a Catholic, and that this is a Protestant country. No matter whose brains he knocked out, he had no right to knock them out, and the man who lost them had a right to keep them. If he should come before a Judge with such a plea, the Judge would reply, "It is no reason, because you are in a Protestant country, that you should kill a Catholic. The law knows nothing of Protestants and Catholics; it knows only citizens." But the prisoner's attorney might reply, "But the man who murdered this fellow is a most excellent Protestant, and your Honor be Deacon of a Protestant Church. I hope you will take these things into consideration and let this man off." The Judge would cry, "Silence, what right have you to talk of religion, when the question is the rights of man?" If this man was a Catholic, he had a right to his opinion, and to live in a free country, over which the Constitution of the United States prevails, and by its right to be a Catholic is solemnly guaranteed. Now suppose we say that this man's religion is the cause of the war—therefore exterminate it.

The Rights of States and the People.

I say religion is not the cause of the war; but the cause of the war has always been the attempt of one set of men to coerce and browbeat another out of their rights. Did you ever hear of any mischief occurring in your neighborhoods, among your farmers? Did you ever find yourselves in law suits of any other kind, without there being some mischief-making at the bottom of it? Did you ever hear of people having a fight without there having been an attempt of one man to tread upon the toes of another? This law of personal right is one of the first terms our children are taught to pronounce. They come into existence in a country where they hear of the rights of man, of the rights of States, and rights of the people, repeated over and over again, as though it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution to sink it deep into the heart of every one of their posterity. Why, sir, this word has become so strongly imprinted upon the hearts and brains of the people, that it is like an instance I have heard of where three men were to be hung on the same scaffold. The hour came, and they were all arranged in due order to meet their doom. One was finely dressed, was of good blood, being born of good family; one was more of a common-place man, and but ill clad; while the third was a poor, uneducated fellow, who had spent all his life in driving a dray. The hour arrived, and in arraying themselves on the scaffold, the poor fellow with dirty clothes got too near the fine gentleman, and rubbed against him, upon which the fine gentleman flinched, and demanded why he thus discommodated him? "I will stand where I please," replied the poor man, "I have as much right to be here as you have." [Loud laughter.] I say, then, that it was not religion, it was not slavery that was the cause of the war, but the intermeddling of one set of men with another; it was the intermeddling of the Northern fanatics with the rights and opinions and property of the people of the South. [Cries of "That is so."] Now, my friends, I tell you that I never justified this resort to arms, because I have believed that if our more appeal had been made to the public sense, the Democratic party would have acquired sufficient strength to have prevented this terrible disaster. Since the beginning of the world no greater misfortune has occurred to mankind, than letting these rogues and plotters into the Administration of the country. While the Democratic party stood firm and united, it had succeeded in resisting this attempt to localize the strife of the country for forty years from its first introduction into the councils of this country. The Abolition party seized upon the breach made in the Democratic party to acquire power. I will not undertake to detain you by going into all the minute forms and intrigues which they employed to sustain command of those who stood in opposition to our Democratic party. You will remark that the ancestors had always cautioned against sectional strife, because they foresaw that all such strife tended to array one section of the Union against another, and to precipitate the country into civil war.

Sectional Agitation.

Now, my friends, when the Democratic party for years before denounced the Abolition agitation in the North—when they warned the country of the dangers which this agitation was likely to produce in the country, they were answered by being called "Union Savers." In the way of derision; they were scoffed at; they were denounced as men who wanted to create a false alarm in the country in order to carry the Presidential election. You see what happened. The Abolitionists came into power—and how? By a vote of a majority of the American people? No, sir. They came into power with one million majority against them; but the constitutional forms permitted the President to take his seat, notwithstanding. Why was the majority so great against him? It was because the Chicago Platform had made a test for Mr. Lincoln to take. The Chicago Platform was a declaration of war and hostility to the people of the South, as being the owners of slaves. That platform was the true origin of this war. When they advanced that platform and placed their candidate upon it, the South saw that their safety consisted in resisting his election at the polls, and the whole fifteen States voted in a solid body against him. Now, Mr. Lincoln, be it remembered, came in as the first President upon a sectional question. All other Presidents had been elected by the votes given partly in the North and South, and partly in the East and West. Lincoln was the first sectional candidate who succeeded in obtaining power, and obtained that power while having a million less votes than the votes cast against him. Now, my friends, it ought to have been admonition enough to Mr. Lincoln to see that fifteen States contiguous to each other, having a common interest, had voted against him. That was sufficient proof of the danger which the Southern people felt their most important rights were exposed to. He knew that his election was purely sectional; that not one slave State had voted for him; and he knew that he was supported by a bare majority in the free section of the Union. Now, my friends, mark what I am going to say. I want to do justice in this contest, and while I condemn the resort to arms on the part of the South, I must do them justice in pointing out the cause which excited them to it. The Northern and Southern States had all equal rights by Constitution; that equality of rights was not only acknowledged in the body of the instrument, but was recognized in its sovereign embodiment in two clauses of the Constitution. The first was that clause which gives to each State one vote in the Presidential election, when, in consequence of the failure of the people to elect, it goes in to the House of Representatives. Delaware, the smallest State, and little larger than one of your counties, has one vote, and New York, though it is as big as this State, has but one vote. In the Senate of the United States the State sovereignty is again recognized. Delaware, the smallest State, sends two Senators to that body, while New York and Pennsylvania, the largest States in the Union, send but two members to that body. These provisions in the Constitution were put there to enable the States to defend their sovereignty against the preponderance of members in the House of Representatives. Now, mark you, here was a provision intended to guard minorities against what might be the ambition or capriciousness of majorities. In the progress of society the black population had passed to the South. We made way for the filling up of the North with a white population. In the progress of society under Democratic auspices, mark you; for I must stop here in my argument to recall to your recollection that though these fellows are talking and denouncing Democrats, that the Democratic party, so far from being in favor of cutting up the Union, was the only party that ever added anything to the Union. Who purchased Louisiana? A Democratic President. Who purchased Florida? A Democratic President. Who took in Texas? The Democratic party. Who took in California? The Democratic party. Who were the war-party when our enemies were foreigners? The Democratic party. Who were the peace party when foreigners were our enemies? [A voice, "Tom Corwin and Abe Lincoln."] The Abolitionists. [Cheers.]

The Democratic Party Always True to the Union.

Now, mark that in every case where an attempt has been made to invade the rights of man, the rights of States, or the integrity of the Union, the Democratic party has come up to defend and save them, and has succeeded up to this time. [Cheers.] When in power, the anti-Democratic Administration undertook to do—what? What do you suppose they undertook to do? They had the same hatred of foreigners which these Abolitionists now have. They got their President, the father of the head of their party of late years—they got their President and their Congress to pass a law, known for its infamy under the name of the "Alien Act." By that act Mr. President Adams was enabled to jerk up anybody that happened to be born out of his section. By another law of the same description, they could arrest any man for publishing a paper like the Cincinnati Enquirer or the Columbus Oriole. But I don't mean to slander these fellows, for they never pretend that they could take a man before a drum-head court martial of jackasses. They gave men the benefit of trial under the Sedition Law, even in my day. I am fifty-six. Somebody asked me how long I intend to live. I don't know—but I mean to outlive the Abolition party. In my day we took money out of the public treasury and paid back the same of men who were fined and imprisoned under that old gag law. Matthew Lyons, him who had been fined and imprisoned under the John Adams Sedition Law, we paid the money that had been unjustly taken from the man for writing and talking. And now we have to witness, in our own day, and within the limits of this Congressional District, a far more odious form: When the integrity of the Union became assailed, who was it that saved it?

The Democratic Party the Only Party that ever Added Anything to the Union.

When these same Yankees—the six New England States—met at the Hartford Convention, at the time we were struggling against and in the midst of the war with Great Britain—

mean the war that followed our independence, the war of 1812—they met just as Jefferson Davis' conspirators met—that is, to embarrass and destroy the Government of their country, when it was engaged in a foreign war with its old antagonist. You remark that they were a little less generous than Jeff. Davis. Jeff. Davis did not wait till we were at war with England, to wage a war with us. The Abolitionists of that day, like true Copperheads and Blacksnakes, snaked in the grass, hid themselves and seized upon the propitious moment, when their country was engaged in a deadly grapple, to go and join a foreign enemy. I know these fellows make a horrible howl against those of the South who were fools enough to imitate their example. Who was it that put down the attempt to divide the Union—that first attempt at secession? Was it those Copperheads? It was the Democratic party—the party who say the Union shall be saved—the rights of the States shall be secured, and the liberties of the people shall be secured. [Cheers.] The Democratic party put that down; but how? Just as they put down South Carolina, that undertook to shabby out of the Union, under the lead of Calhoun. When our party has been in power, it has never threatened the liberty of the people or the rights of a State, but has always brought the country safe through danger. [Cheers.] We put down South Carolina nullification; and how? By calling out seventy-five thousand men? No, by murdering seven or eight hundred thousand men? By making a million and a half of orphans in this country? That's not the work that Democrats have done! [Not so!] These bloody scenes were reserved for the Abolitionists to produce. [Cheers.] This dark and woolly ghost passed over the stage. Her train was followed by a stream of blood, intermingled with the bones of a million of men. No, sir; we put down the effort to enslave the people by reliance on the laws, by appealing to the reason of the people. Our President's proclamation breathed the language of a father addressed to his erring children.

General Jackson.

What did Jackson do, who is now become a sort of deity with his country, next to Washington? If we had the same superstition that the Romans had at the death of Caesar, he would be placed among the deities; but, acknowledging but one God, as we do, we will only claim for the honored General the title of second of mankind. Old General Jackson, whom many men thought to be a monster, and good, honest men thought so, too—for so much had been said against the old man, in every form and shape, that honest and intelligent men got misled. But time removes the beam from the eye; time enables the slowest reason to reach the truth in the end. All we want is time and truth; and with these nothing can injure the liberties of this country. Jackson's proclamation was a sort of sermon on the Mount. It was a great appeal from the head of a great people to a portion of his fellow countrymen, who were about to plunge their country into trouble and themselves into personal danger. His appeal had its effect and saved the Union, and without costing one solitary drop of blood.

The North vs. the South.

Now, my friends, look at the case. I have told you that Lincoln had not received one single vote from the slave States, fifteen in number. His Chicago platform had frightened the people of the South, and made them seek to defend themselves through the instrumentality of the ballot box. Well, now, mark you, I told you that the States had a kind of security afforded in two clauses of the Constitution to their sovereign rights. They were in a minority, both in regard to the number of States and the number of people. It had been predicted by Mr. Calhoun, and all the men who had looked to the slavery agitation as a source of danger, that the time would come when the fanaticism of the country would band the whole North against the whole South.

It had been said that the North would take the entire government of the country into their own hands; make any laws that they wished, without any regard to the people occupying these fifteen States. All this was treated as mere humbug—mere electioneering slang at the time; and yet we saw, three years ago, this very consummation happened. Here was a President elected by a section on one side of the line which separated the free from the slave States. Here was a House of Representatives and a Senate; the majority of both was elected by the people of the free States. All that they had to do, therefore, was to say: "We will it that the South shall have no rights; we will it that the South shall go back and bear to us the same relation which we bore to the British crown before the Revolution; we will reduce the South to a mere colony; we will have it in our power, and we will begin with the abolition of slavery." What could the South do? The North had shown that it not only had the power of seizing on the whole country, but had actually done the thing; had seized on the Government, and the South barely stood by, knowing what they had to expect at the hands of their masters. What could the South do if Lincoln and his gang chose to pass laws to abolish slavery? What use would it be for the South to say: "Oh, here's the Constitution!" Mr. Lincoln had nothing to do but to say: "I don't so construe the Constitution; I, Lincoln, being elected by Northern States, have a right to do what I choose with Southern

States." What could the South do? There it was. Now who ever heard of a man willing to hold his rights and interests subject to the will, caprice and good pleasure of another man? I put the question to you in regard to your own private affairs. You are a farmer; you have your land; your horses and your cattle upon it; your house with your family in it; you stay there; you go to sleep at night in as perfect security, with your \$2,000 of property, as your neighbor with his \$50,000. Why? Because the same law that guards your sleeping couch guards his. He has no more right to take your property against your will, than you have to take his. This law which knows no distinction, it being based upon right, and having for its rightful object the equal protection of all men, is the most precious right the poor man has; and far more interested, therefore, in this matter of speech and trial by jury is the poor man, than the richest man in the country. A man of wealth may have an influential circle; he may be able to use his money for the purpose of strengthening his defenses, and even sometimes of diminishing the amount of penalty which may be imposed upon him. He, therefore, if all the laws were swept away, would have a fund of power left. But take it away from the poor man, and what has he left? Take the law from the feeble, and what have they left? Take away the law that protects your wives and daughters, and what have they left? Immediately if you take away the law, you leave the masses defenseless—a prey to the most vicious. It is the law which protects the poor man; the poor man who has nothing but the law to protect him. At all times he can cry out: "I am an American citizen, and I am protected by the guarantees of personal and political liberty." Now, you stand in this relation to your neighbor. How would you like it for your neighbor to say: "Well, my dear friend, you want no protection to the titles of your farm or land, or for your person?" I want to put this case to every man. I was about to illustrate the condition of the South, in reference to the North, by asking you how you would like to hold your property at the will and pleasure of another man?

You are upon a piece of land, and you know that your neighbor can turn you off when he pleases; he comes and says: "You know, Mr. Jamieson: that I am a good hearted man; that I never did you any wrong or harm; I never did my neighbors any harm; but you are afraid to put in that crop of corn, because I'll not give you a number of years to hold the land. You are afraid that when the crop is ripe I will order you off and take the corn. You know I'll not do this. You know I am a very clever man." "But," you would say, "clever as you are, I want something cleverer than that to defend me and my rights. Upon this crop of corn depends the maintenance of me and my children; and if you should come here and say, 'Leave here,' I want to be able to say, 'I'll leave here when I've gathered my corn crop, and not before. I wish to have my rights depend upon some unchanging principle, and not upon the caprice or volition of any man or set of men.'" Do we not see the same thing every year in voting? Every body knows that in voting for Governor or legislator there are so many majorities. Why not just say so at the ballot-box, and take the will of the majority as a law? The minority says: "Perhaps we may disagree about what the will of the majority is; in order that there may be no mistake, let it down in the legislative act; we want no guess-work here." "I want a law that will guard me when I am not watching; that will guard my little children when they are not able to guard themselves; a law that will block up my threshold as effectually as stone and mortar block up that of the wealthiest; a law that will also protect the minority as well as the majority." That's the kind of law we want. How could the Southern people act when they were turned over to the mercies of the North?

The Chicago Platform was a Declaration of War.

But when the North had shown that they were determined to take the entire Government into their hands, they had shown it, not merely in the platform and Presidential election, but by calling to the Washington Cabinet every man who was deadly opposed to the interests of the South. But more than that, their platform was a declaration of war, that the Southern States from this day forward, be expelled from the Union. The Chicago platform expelled the Southern States from the Confederacy, so far as that party could expel them. If Douglas had been elected, would this war have happened? Would this Union have been dissolved? If any one of the other candidates that were before the people had been elected, would any such thing have happened? No! What was the cause of the war? It was the intermeddling of this party with slavery in the Chicago Platform, and it was the carrying out of the Chicago Platform in the organization of the Cabinet, and in the refusal of the President to listen to the voice of the fifteen States that were for the Union.

But Mr. Lincoln and his party take refuge under the plea that they could not anticipate all that has happened. But what do the masses pay a President for if he can not anticipate dangers? But do you see how far below the intelligence of the most ordinary laboring man in this country Mr. Lincoln was. When on his way to Washington, he replied in reference to the dangers of the country, who's hurt? Let any one ask him now, who's hurt? Let him ask himself, repeating his old question put nearly three

years ago, who's hurt? and the hundreds of thousands of fresh graves will send forth a response. [Cries of "That's so."] A million and a half of widows and orphans will send forth a response. The desolation of the fairest country on the globe will send forth a response. The blighted hopes of the brightest hopes the world ever had send forth a response. The Mourning of the People. The mourning of the people that is every where being heard will send forth the response to that question, "Who's hurt?" My God! let him put down that question in 1863, and then put it down in 1865, and let him bring the answers arranged one after another, as I have arranged them, and he will not ask, "Who's hurt?" The great question will be, who is not hurt? [Cries of "That's so," and cheers.] Nobody can answer that question but the contractors that buy miles and beams—contractors and office holders the men that swarm like maggots in the national cheese; these men are the ones that are not hurt. The black garments that shroud the mother and sisters of the grave who have fallen, tell that they are hurt. Those who ought to be there now shaking hands with us in congratulation, are now in their graves. Another million are now commissioned to go forth with this business of wholesale murder, and every newspaper brings us the bloody chronicle shot down at this or the other ravine; so many tens of thousands wounded or dying in the hospital. Every paper brings these things, and Mr. Lincoln wants to know who's hurt? Who tried to prevent all this? The same party that did succeed in preventing it when they had the power.

The Alien and Sedition Law.

In the case of the Alien and Sedition Law, in the case of the Hartford Convention, and in the case of nullification in South Carolina, the Democratic party prevented it by peaceable means. Lincoln has shed enough blood, to float the Great Eastern, and how much nearer the end does he get? [Cries of "None."] His cry is still for blood. The Administration stands on tip-toe, every day, with its eyes distended and its arms stretched forth, calling on the American people for more blood and more money. [Applause.] And their preachers—those Chicago priests that went to Detroit to get Lincoln to bite the forbidden fruit, to commit the first, the initial sin, by the publication of an act emancipating the slaves—these priests, I would not like to have met these fellows; they went down, caning and whining, their mouths all the way watering for the blood of the people. Every one of them thought that God had made it his special business to go and beg Lincoln to commence the business of murdering the American people. When did we have civil war? The first year the Abolitionists came into power. How happens it that under Federal Administrations, Whig Administrations, and Democratic Administrations, no war, no speak of war, ever existed between our own people? How happens it, that before that time, the Government of the United States, on the day of Lincoln's election, had not one solitary prison within the limits of the Republic—the very jail and penitentiary at Columbus were used for the punishment of mail robbers and quick criminals, because the Federal Government had no jails—and now, although they have walled in half the country, there is not room for half the prisoners they have taken? I ask, then—this being the case—what right these fellows have to clamor against the Democratic party? I have shown you that under the Democratic party all the acquisitions of territory have been made. We have enlarged the Republic on all sides under our party. The rights of the people have been protected, as to the matter of the Alien and Sedition Law. Under our party the rights of the States have been protected, by the repudiation of the ideas of carrying on internal improvements and other local interests by the General Government. It was the Democratic party that stood forth then as the defender of the rights of the States. Thus in these three great fundamental principles—the Sovereignty of the People, the Rights of the States, and the Integrity of the Union—when such and every one of these were attacked, it was our party, and no other, that came forward to the rescue, and succeeded in perpetuating the Government in prosperity, peace and happiness, up to the time that Lincoln took his oath of office, and then commenced the evil. [Applause.]

The Democratic Party to Guide the Destinies of the Nation.

Well, now, "Who so proper to guide the destinies of the nation as the Democratic party?" say the people! This shows what the meaning of the people is—how true the instincts of the people are. The people being aware of the whole history of the country, and seeing who it was that saved the country from former dangers—their Government being now exposed to greater dangers than ever; exposed to all the dangers of a dissolution of the Union, and the disregard of the rights of citizens—seeing all this, they very naturally look out for what is to save them, and they say it is the old Democratic party that must save the ship safe into the haven, notwithstanding the rocks and breakers. We have brought the old vessel through nearly three quarters of a century; not a plank was cracked; not a nail was loose; not a piece of sail as big as your hand was gone, when we turned over to Government to Lincoln! It was a sound and secure as when it came from the hands of its makers. It had all the security that human genius could devise for a long duration of the Government.

The Democratic Party to Guide the Destinies of the Nation.

Well, now, "Who so proper to guide the destinies of the nation as the Democratic party?" say the people! This shows what the meaning of the people is—how true the instincts of the people are. The people being aware of the whole history of the country, and seeing who it was that saved the country from former dangers—their Government being now exposed to greater dangers than ever; exposed to all the dangers of a dissolution of the Union, and the disregard of the rights of citizens—seeing all this, they very naturally look out for what is to save them, and they say it is the old Democratic party that must save the ship safe into the haven, notwithstanding the rocks and breakers. We have brought the old vessel through nearly three quarters of a century; not a plank was cracked; not a nail was loose; not a piece of sail as big as your hand was gone, when we turned over to Government to Lincoln! It was a sound and secure as when it came from the hands of its makers. It had all the security that human genius could devise for a long duration of the Government.